

ETSC CERTIFICATION SUBCOMMITTEE
June 21, 2005
Meeting Minutes

PRESENT: John Bawol, Harriet Miller Brown, William Charon, James Fyvie, Dale Gribler, Suzan Hensel, Jim Loeper, Leonard Norman, Charles Nystrom

ABSENT: Dan Loftus, Christina Russell

OTHERS PRESENT: Ralph Gould

Chairman Charon called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present. Those persons in absence were previously excused.

I. Approval of Minutes

Jim Loeper moved to approve the minutes of May 24, 2005. James Fyvie supported.

There was a question under item II. Old Business, B. Compliance Status Updates 2. Kent County - requesting clarification on a FOR CAUSE review of Phase 1 implementation. This was confirmed as the action taken.

Motion carried. Dale Gribler abstained.

II. Old Business

Chairman Charon advised to divert from the presented agenda moving item B. Kent County Compliance to item A.

A. Kent County Compliance

The State 911 Administrator's office received information from one carrier, Nextel, and questions from Centennial and Sprint regarding wireless deployment in Kent County, particularly the Grand Rapids PSAP. A preliminary check determined that Sprint is Phase I implemented; Verizon cut over to Phase I, for the entire county, to the Rockford Post; Nextel had no cutover.

Chairman Charon, Harriet Miller- Brown, and Suzan Hensel met with Ralph Gould on June 15. Information presented revealed that Phase I in Kent County is complete with the exception of Nextel; Centennial and Sprint are works in progress (expansion of their networks).

The issue with Nextel was that they initially deployed in 2003 and that the format of PANI/ALI was not acceptable to the Grand Rapids PSAP, due to the call back number location in the incorrect field. Further, that Grand Rapids asked that, based on this condition, Nextel not deploy and Nextel reverted back to Phase 0 with call delivery to the Rockford Post.

Ralph Gould advised this was not true. While the alternative format was preferred, he never advised them to turn off Phase I.

The findings of the visit to Grand Rapids were that Kent County did not have deployment of Phase I with all carriers as of December 31, 2004. However, at this time compliance was defined as at a state of readiness to receive Phase I calls, not actually receiving them.

As of June 22, 2005 Nextel will be fully deployed with Phase I in Kent County.

Chairman Charon clarified that, with the last compliance mailing, the compliance definition changed to include a county must put in their Phase II request and work actively to deploy same in order to satisfy 6th year certification.

Chairman Charon stated he feels Kent County was deployed per the active definition at the time and per statute. His recommendation is that Kent County is currently compliant for the next quarterly fund disbursement.

There was discussion, raised by Charlie Nystrom, that the motion made at the May meeting was that we would perform a compliance review for Kent County. Chairman Charon responded that we did do that for Phase I. Charlie Nystrom stated this should have been a complete review. Jim Fyvie stated the compliance review was limited to and focused on Phase I. Jim Loeper recalled that the discussion at the May subcommittee meeting was to select another county for random review and Kent County was also identified for a "for cause" review. Dale Gribler stated the review was limited for purposes of the current quarterly certification, and then continue on to conduct a full review of Kent County.

There was then detailed discussion about maps received by GRPD and problems with accuracy of said maps, etc.

Charlie Nystrom stated he feels Kent County is not compliant and should not be approved for additional funds until the completion of a full review.

Following additional discussion, Chairman Charon asked that on December 31, did Kent County meet the definition of compliance, which was then defined as a state of readiness. A state of readiness is the issue, not receiving calls.

Dale Gribler made the motion that Kent County is compliant with Phase I for the third quarter certification and that a complete compliance review be conducted with Kent County by the December, 2005 ETSC meeting date. Chairman Charon supported the motion.

After more discussion, Dale Gribler withdrew his motion. Bill Charon supported.

Dale Gribler moved to certify Kent County for third quarter funds, as they are Phase I compliant. Bill Charon supported.

Discussion: Bill advised that Phase I calls were received as of the deadline. The compliance definition did not change until March 15, 2005. Charlie Nystrom stated we have not allowed any wiggle room for CMRS, and we must hold ourselves (PSAPs) to the same standard. He also pointed out that Dobson says they are delivering Phase II, even if it doesn't work, and we are holding their feet to the fire with the FCC.

Roll Call Vote: Fyvie – yes; Gribler – yes; Bawol – yes; Loeper – no; Nystrom – no; Norman – yes; Charon – yes; Hensel – no.

The vote was 5 yes, 3 no. Motion carried.

Dale Gribler moved to conduct a compliance review, for cause, of Kent County to be completed by the December 2005 ETSC meeting. John Bawol supported.

Discussion: Nystrom – it was indicated in the May 25th minutes that a full review of Kent County would follow. Also, filings sent to the State 911 Administrator's office indicated that is not being done. There must be Phase II compliance (requested) by June 30th.

Roll Call Vote: Fyvie – yes; Gribler – yes; Bawol – yes; Loeper – yes; Nystrom – yes; Norman – yes; Charon – no; Hensel – yes.

The vote was 7 yes, 1 no. Motion carried.

B. Compliance Reviews

1. Leelanau County – still pending
2. Isabella County – paperwork due at the end of this week.

III. New Business

A. Certification of Counties for 3rd Quarter Disbursement

No motion was made to certify the other counties as all counties except for Kent had been approved for certification at the May 24th Certification Subcommittee meeting.

B. Definition of “at a state of readiness to deploy . . .”

The new language of “actively seeking deployment” was recommended for approval to the full ETSC.

IV. Call for Public Comment – Jim Loeper asked for reconsideration on the decision to have signs be on the non allowable list. He did state this will be appealed to the ETSC. No action at this time.

V. Next Meeting

Certification Subcommittee
Page Four
June 21, 2005

The next meeting of the Certification Subcommittee will be in Hart at the Comfort Inn on August 4, at 4:00 p.m.

VI. Adjourn

Jim Fyvie moved to adjourn the meeting. Charlie Nystrom supported. Motion carried.